



Brunetta, G. (2012) '*Laus vera et humili saepe contingit viro, non nisi potenti falsa*: reflections on praise and flattery in the imperial age'.

*Rosetta* **12**: 20-34.

[http://www.rosetta.bham.ac.uk/Issue\\_12/brunetta.pdf](http://www.rosetta.bham.ac.uk/Issue_12/brunetta.pdf)

---

***Laus vera et humili saepe contingit viro, non nisi potenti falsa: reflections on praise and flattery in the imperial age***

Giulia Brunetta

*Royal Holloway, University of London*

A theme that has often been discussed in ancient literature disputing about morality is the importance of truth both in official and private contexts. However, what seems to be a recurring motif in works with an educational aim, becomes more challenging in literature of praise. More specifically, in the early Roman empire, this type of literary production, known as encomium, *i.e.* any form of literature praising someone's virtues, develops specific characteristics which counteract the primitive goal of praise. This type of literature in fact undergoes a process of detachment for a profession of truth, and becomes a display of an idealized set of images and formulae. With the present work my aim is to examine this process with particular attention to the poetry of Statius and Martial. A discussion of the language of praise developed by the two Flavian poets is in fact necessary in order to reassess the relevance of their strategy of encomium (and of Statius' *Silvae* in particular). For long, in fact, this collection of occasional poetry has been regarded as mere flattery and a passive reception of the official propaganda promoted by the emperor Domitian.<sup>1</sup>

From ancient literature aimed at advising the sovereign on how to be the perfect ruler, this new type of encomium presents a new reality of the imperial *persona*: the emperor does not need to be advised, as he is idealized as the perfect ruler. A specific divine imagery is employed in order to convey this idea. The extravagance of the language of praise in Statius and Martial creates an impasse for the later panegyrists, and leads to the anxieties of the *Panegyricus Traiani* of Pliny the Younger, and the satiric comments of Juvenal. Finally, as a conclusion to this paper, a brief incursion into Nicolò Machiavelli's *Il Principe* will show how praise and flattery can be used as effective political tools for the leader to create consensus and hold power.

\*\*\*

In his treatise 'How to distinguish a friend from a flatterer', Plutarch argues that one needs friends not just for companionship, but as truth-tellers. For this reason, he defines the

---

<sup>1</sup> This issue is remarked by Rosati 2010, pp. 265-266 with bibliography.

flatterer as an enemy of truth, who is changeable and always seeks to please others instead of giving advice.

The traditional division between praise, which is felt as genuine, and flattery, which is perceived as false, seems to be consistent in ancient literature. Literary advice for good moral conduct is displayed along the same lines as Plutarch also by Isocrates in two orations, the *Ad Demonicum* and the *Ad Nicoclem*. The two speeches outline a model of ideal behaviour that applies to the private citizen (Demonicus) as well as to a figure with official duties (Nicocles). In both cases, Isocrates warns his addressees about the dangers of flattery and the importance of true friends and officers (Isocr., *Ad Dem.* 30 and *Ad Nic.* 28):

Abhor flatterers as you would deceivers; for both, if trusted, injure those who trust them. If you admit to your friendship men who seek your favor for the lowest ends, your life will be lacking in friends who will risk your displeasure for the highest good. Be affable in your relations with those who approach you, and never haughty; for the pride of the arrogant even slaves can hardly endure, whereas when men are affable all are glad to bear with their ways.

Regard as your most faithful friends, not those who praise everything you say or do, but those who criticize your mistakes. Grant freedom of speech to those who have good judgment, in order that when you are in doubt you may have friends who will help you to decide. Distinguish between those who artfully flatter and those who loyally serve you, that the base may not fare better than the good.

Although these examples belong to a specific type of literature, the trend reflected gives a consistent imagery of moral coherence to be adopted in social contexts. The dichotomy praise/flattery appears to have no open possibilities to be brought together to create a positive model.

During the years of the Roman republic, in his philosophical treatise on *amicitia* in the homonymous work, Cicero also gives advices with a similar intent, with the hope that in this way a new social basis can be created, starting from genuine human connections (*Lael.* 5.18; 9.29):

*Sed hoc primum sentio, nisi in bonis amicitiam esse non posse.*

This, however, I do feel first of all - that friendship cannot exist except among good men.

*Quod si tanta vis probitatis est, ut eam vel in eis, quos numquam vidimus, et, quod maius est, in hoste etiam diligamus, quid mirum est, si animi hominum moveantur, cum eorum, quibuscum usu coniuncti esse possunt, virtutem et bonitatem perspicere videantur? Quamquam confirmatur amore beneficio accepto et studio perspecto et consuetudine adiuncta, quibus rebus ad illum primum motum animi et amoris adhibitis admirabilis quaedam exardescit benevolentiae magnitudo.*

Now if the force of integrity is so great that we love it, whether in those we have never seen, or, more wonderful still, even in an enemy, what wonder that men's souls are stirred when they think they see clearly the virtue and goodness of those with whom a close intimacy is possible? And yet love is further strengthened by the receiving of a kindly service, by the evidence of another's care for us, and by closer familiarity, and from all these, when joined to the soul's first impulse to love, there springs up, if I may say so, a marvellous glow and greatness of goodwill.

Opposed to the traditional promotion of praise based on the encouragement and display of truth, the encomiastic literature composed during the Flavian age (and under Domitian in particular) has suffered for a very long time from a general antipathy from part of the scholarship,<sup>2</sup> which has read it as a betrayal of what an encomium should be, according to the ancient standards of praise. If one was to follow this line of interpretation, the encomiastic poets writing during this period were compelled to support the official propaganda in a passive way, rendering the genre of encomium just an instrument of flattery of the imperial power.

The most relevant court poets writing under Domitian - Statius and Martial - in their respective poetic productions develop a new language of encomium, that has too often been underestimated as a mere reflection of a propagandistic imposition by the court of Domitian, or else subversiveness.<sup>3</sup> On the contrary, the two poets do not lack in originality, and cultural propaganda should not be regarded as a one-way phenomenon. Even if the particular nature of encomiastic poetry requires that the poet speak well of their recipient, nonetheless the two poets engage in many ways with the political power of the court. Firstly, they construct a specific idea of the world and impose this vision in their poems;

---

<sup>2</sup>Starting from Garthwaite 1984 and Ahl 1989, and more recently Newlands 2002.

<sup>3</sup> This dichotomy has affected the studies on Statius till very recently. More balanced works are now among others the two miscellaneous volumes on the poetry of Statius (Nauta-van Dam-Smolenaars 2006) and Flavian poetry (Nauta-van Dam-Smolenaars 2008).

secondly, they promote a negotiation with the power that heightens their role as court poets. More than in the past, the encomiasts of the imperial age deal with an autarchic connotation of the imperial power and of the figure of the emperor in particular. In a world that becomes more and more hierarchical, Statius and Martial portray an ideal society of equals, where there are no social boundaries.

Consequently, it does not surprise that the lexicon of love and all its cognates (*amor*, *amare*, *amicus*, *amicitia*) occur so often in the poetry of Statius and Martial to define social relationships. The poets seem to continue with a trend started during the late Republic, which becomes more accentuated during the Augustan age, to define social and political relations where a disparity of social status is particularly significant.<sup>4</sup> This 'language of *amor*' finds its most evident application in imperial encomia, where the love between the emperor and his subjects is idealised.<sup>5</sup>

In a passage from the *De Officiis* - albeit being circumstantial - Cicero already identifies love, and not fear, as the best political tool (Cic., *Off.* 2.23):

*Omnium autem rerum nec aptius est quicquam ad opes tuendas ac tenendas quam diligere nec alienius quam timeri [...] Malus enim est custos diuturnitatis metus contraque benivolentia fidelis vel ad perpetuitatem.*

Of all these things then no one is more suitable for maintaining the power than being loved, no one more opposed than being feared [...] Fear in fact is a bad guardian for who wants to hold power for long, benevolence instead is a loyal guardian forever.

However, in the imperial age this idea loses any claim of authenticity, and ends up being a new way to construct reality. The language of love seems to work particularly well when dealing with a *dominus*, as it implies a negotiation between the poet and the object of their attention; for this reason, the lexicon employed often overlaps with the linguistic vocabulary of elegy. Like the elegiac poet in fact, the encomiast aims to please and conquers the recipient's attention by offering them their most precious gift, poetic immortality. It is undeniable that Ovid's experimentation with the language of elegy

---

<sup>4</sup> On the idea of court and the passage from the principate to the empire see Wallace-Hadrill 1996.

<sup>5</sup> See Rosati 2003.

(especially in the poetry of the exile) has a great influence on the encomiastic poetry developed by the Flavian poets.<sup>6</sup>

The lexicon of love is particularly displayed in the progressive idealization of the imperial figure, whose power is regarded as divine. The assimilation of Domitian to a star or even to Jupiter results in feelings of religious devotion in his subjects (Mart., *Ep.* 8.11, 7-8 and 8.56):

*Nullum Roma ducem, nec te sic, Caesar, amavit:  
Te quoque iam non plus, ut velit ipsa, potest.*

No sovereign Rome has loved more, nor so much you, Caesar: and even if you wanted, it could not now love you more.

*Magna licet totiens tribuas, maiora daturus  
dona, ducum victor, victor et ipse tui,  
diligetis populo non propter praemia, Caesar,  
te propter populus praemia, Caesar, amat.*

Although you often make great donations and are ready to give even more, winner of leaders and winner even of yourself, it is not because of your favours that you are loved by the people, Caesar, but it is because of you that the people love, Caesar, your favours.

Although these themes are inherited from the past (mainly from archaic Greek lyric and Latin elegy),<sup>7</sup> they are not employed passively by Statius and Martial. As it has been stated previously, one should not be thinking of their poetry as an imposition from the court. Encomiastic poetry also works as an independent initiative, for which the poets develop popular cultural models for the world of the court, and in this way they can act as 'behaviour controllers', and from a privileged position they can impose specific standards for their addressees to meet. Thus poetry becomes a *praeconium* - an instrument of negotiation with the political power.

---

<sup>6</sup> For further readings on this aspect of Ovid's exile poetry see Nagle 1980, Galasso 1987 and Fedeli 2007.

<sup>7</sup> The association of the *laudandus* with a star or a divinity is in fact traditional in encomia. For a recap of the theme see Nisbet-Hubbard 1970, p. 163, n. 48: 'It was a commonplace in encomia, whether erotic, athletic, or political, that the person praised surpassed all rivals as the sun, moon, or Lucifer outshone other heavenly bodies'.

The poetic self-awareness of the encomiast is particularly apparent in Martial, who negotiates his art with the emperor, as it emerges in the following epigrams (Mart. 4.31, 1-4; 5.13; 9.18):

*Quod cupis in nostris dicique legique libellis  
Et nonnullus honos creditur iste tibi,  
Ne valeam, si non res est gratissima nobis  
et volo te chartis inseruisse meis*

The fact that you want to be cited and mentioned in my books and think that it is of some honour to you, might I die if it does not delight me. I would like to include you in my writings...

*Sum, fateor, semperque fui, Callistrate, pauper  
sed non obscurus nec male notus eques,  
sed toto legor orbe frequens et dicitur 'hic est',  
quodque cinis paucis hoc mihi uita dedit.  
At tua centenis incumbunt tecta columnis  
et libertinas arca flagellat opes,  
magnaque Niliacae seruit tibi glaeba Syenes  
tondet et innumeros Gallica Parma greges.  
Hoc ego tuque sumus: sed quod sum non potes esse  
tu quod es e populo quilibet esse potest.*

I am and I admit, always have been poor, Callistratus, but I am not an equestrian of no or bad fame: I am well read all over the world and I am pointed out at; what death has given to few, I had in life. You own a palace holding on a hundred columns and your cash box accumulates riches of a libertus; many lands in Niliac Syenes are subjected to you, and Gallic Parma shears for you countless herds. This is what we are, you and I: but what I am you cannot be, what you are any among the common people can be.

*Est mihi – sitque precor longum te praeside, Caesar -  
rus minimum, parui sunt et in urbe lares.  
Sed de ualle breui quas det sitientibus hortis  
curua laboratas antlia tollit aquas:  
sicca domus queritur nullo se rore foueri,  
cum mihi uicino Marcia fonte sonet.  
Quam dederis nostris, Auguste, penatibus undam,  
Castalis haec nobis aut louis imber erit.*

I own - and I hope I will keep the possession for long under your administration, Caesar - a very small country estate and a small house in town. But hardly from a shallow cavity the curved lever pumps water to give to the thirsty garden: my dry house complains that no dew refreshes it, even if from nearby the rumble of the Marcia water can be heard. The

water you will give, Augustus, to my Penates, will be for me the spring Castalis, or the rain of Jupiter.

What appears evident, especially in the last passage, is the double level at which the poet negotiates with the emperor. On the one hand, his request for water for his house has a practical purpose; on the other hand, the water he will be given will be metaphorically turned into divine inspiration for composing poetry (*undam...Castalis haec nobis aut louis imber erit*).

If one reads this kind of poetry as a mutual exchange of favours between our poets and Domitian, I hope it will become evident how encomiastic poetry is much more than just flattery of the current regime. At the same time, authenticity is not what Statius and Martial look for in their praise of the emperor and Rome. The increasingly exaggerated imperial imagery associated with Domitian does not aim to reflect reality, but to construct an ideal vision of the world. With the accentuation of the power held by the emperor, encomiastic poetry needs to be extreme in order to fulfill it. In a way, flattery becomes the true sign of an unlimited power.

Immediately after the reign of Domitian, the consequences of such an interpretation of the language of praise are reflected in the works of Juvenal and Pliny the Younger.

In *Satire 4*, Juvenal ridicules Domitian by emphasizing explicitly the level of flatterers and adulation created during his reign (Juv., *Sat.* 4.65-71):

*[...] tum Picens 'accipe' dixit  
'priuatis maiora focus. Genialis agatur  
iste dies. propera stomachum laxare sagina  
et tua seruatum consume in saecula rhombum.  
ipse capi uoluit.' quid apertius? et tamen illi  
surgebant cristae. nihil est quod credere de se  
non possit cum laudatur dis aequa potestas.*

[...] He of Picenum 'receive,' said, 'a fish too big for a private kitchen. Let this be kept as a festive day; hasten to fill out your belly with fat fare, and devour a turbot that has been preserved to grace your reign. The fish itself wanted to be caught'. Could flattery be more gross? Yes his comb began to rise: there is nothing that divine Majesty will not believe concerning itself when lauded to the skies!

It needs to be pointed out that the literary current hostile to Domitian (Juvenal, Pliny, Tacitus *in primis*) makes it difficult to rehabilitate the encomiastic literature which flourished under him. However, the satirical position of Juvenal appears to counterbalance in quite some detail specific aspects of praise that are found in the *Silvae*.<sup>8</sup>

We could say that Statius and Martial push the boundaries of the possibility of making a genuine praise of the sovereign. The extravagance reached by encomiastic literature at this point, and the *impasse* that it creates in the panegyrist is proven by the *Panegyricus Traiani*, composed by Pliny as a *gratiarum actio* for the new emperor.

What clearly emerges from the text is Pliny's obsession with proving his praise genuine and truly felt. After the Domitianic era, Pliny is aware of the danger of doublespeak,<sup>9</sup> but he is confident that Trajan will not read his praise as flattery (Pan. 3.4):

*Non enim periculum est ne, cum loquar de humanitate, exprobrari sibi superbiam credat, cum de frugalitate luxuriam, cum de clementia crudelitatem, cum de liberalitate avaritiam, cum de benignitate livorem, cum de continentia libidinem, cum de labore inertiam, cum de fortitudine timorem.*

There is no risk that when I talk about affability, he might think that arrogance is being reproached, or talking of frugality, wealth, of clemency, cruelty, of generosity, avarice, of goodness, envy, of temperance, excess, of industriousness, laziness, of courage, cowardice.

At the same time, Pliny cannot but employ the very same language as his predecessors, with the difficult task of rehabilitating it in its most genuine value.<sup>10</sup> For example, the lexicon of love is displayed again, especially in opposition to the necessary hatred for the previous emperor Domitian (*Pan.* 68.5; 53. 1-2; 68.7):

*Amamus quidem te in quantum mereris; istud tamen non tui facimus amore sed nostri.*

We love you for you deserve, and still we do not do it for affection to you, but to ourselves.

---

<sup>8</sup>An intertextual analysis of Juvenal and the *Silvae* is currently part of my research.

<sup>9</sup>On this see Bartsch 1994, pp. 183-187.

<sup>10</sup>On this see now the recent contribution of Gibson 2011, pp. 116-124.

*Alioqui nihil non parum grate sine comparatione laudatur. Praeterea hoc primum erga optimum imperatorem piorum ciuium officium est, insequi dissimiles. Neque enim satis amarit bonos principes, qui malos satis non oderit.*

Besides, there is no praise that is appreciated without comparison. Moreover, the first duty of citizens devoted to an excellent emperor is to accuse the ones different from him. Because he who does not loathe enough bad rulers does not love the good ones enough.

*Et alioqui, cum sint odium amorque contraria, hoc perquam simile habent, quod ibi intemperantius amamus bonos principes, ubi liberius malos odimus.*

Moreover, being hatred and love opposed one to the other, on this they agree: that we love good rulers with as much more passion as more freely we hate the bad ones.

However, despite Pliny's efforts to restore a more traditional identity to the encomium, the process seems irreversible, and praising an emperor without sounding false or unnatural seems unavoidable. But what might look like an *impasse* at this point, an obstacle to the appreciation for this genre, turns out to be its most distinctive trait. The idealised world imagined in the encomia of the Flavian poets, where there are no conflicts, the emperor is like a father to his subjects, and there are no social boundaries, imposes itself as an extraordinary model of power.

It is the ultimate consequence of this genre, which ends up reversing its original premises: a formal encomium is no longer seen as a constructive eulogy of the recipient, but as a powerful declaration of a boundless power. In this way, a false encomium becomes the most distinctive trait of a powerful ruler. Oddly enough, it is a literary character who confirms the very nature of power in these terms. Atreus, in Seneca's *Thyestes*, makes in fact a terrible declaration about the true nature of tyranny (Sen., *Thyest.* 205-212):

*At. Maximum hoc regni bonum est,  
Quod facta domini cogitur populus sui  
Tam ferre quam laudare. Sat. Quos cogit meus  
Laudare, eosdem reddit inimicos metus.  
At qui favoris gloriam veri petit,  
Animo magis quam voce laudari volet.  
At. Laus vera et humili saepe contingit viro,  
non nisi potenti falsa. Quod nolunt velint.*

*Atreus.* This is the maximum good of tyranny: the people are forced to bear as much as to praise the actions of their master. *Guard.* Fear compels to praise who fear makes enemy. But who seeks the glory of true favour, will want to be praised in the soul, more than with words. *Atreus.* A sincere praise can happen to anyone, the false one only to the powerful. What they do not want, they must want.

Seneca manages to turn the traditional nature of tyranny into the most distinctive mark of power. Pretention, fear and simulation are no longer features of a bad ruler, as they are portrayed by Cicero or Pliny,<sup>11</sup> but the necessary signs of a successful political power.

From Atreus' words, we gather how the encomium of a ruler is the most effective *when* it is false, and flattery becomes the true sign of power for the fact that private citizens cannot afford to have it. Therefore, terror, fear and deceitfulness become the most efficient instruments of power.

At this point, if we look back at the recommendations of Plutarch or Isocrates on how to avoid flattery in order to be a good leader, their advice could even appear naïve or simplistic. It is not the truth which makes a successful ruler, but the ability to fake the truth. In my opinion, Statius and Martial are ultimately aware of this strategy, and therefore apply it to the new reality of the imperial court.

The modern political thought has also reflected on ancient political models, and often discussed upon the best way to hold political power, and what relationship should exist between the ruler and the citizens.

During the Renaissance, the Italian author Niccolò Machiavelli formulates in his treatise *// Principe* a political theory that looks back to the classical models. In his formulation, a good leader is not the one who is virtuous and good, but the one who is able to fake and

---

<sup>11</sup>Cic. *Lael.* 52-53: *Haec enim est tyrannorum vita nimirum, in qua nulla fides, nulla caritas, nulla stabilis benivolentiae potest esse fiducia, omnia semper suspecta atque sollicita, nullus locus amicitiae. Quis enim aut eum diligit, quem metuat, aut eum, a quo se metui putet? Coluntur tamen simulatione dumtaxat ad tempus. Quod si forte, ut fit plerumque, ceciderunt, tum intellegitur, quam fuerint in opes amicorum.* Plin., *Pan.* 85.1: *Iam etiam et in privatorum animis exoleverat priscum mortalium bonum amicitia, cuius in locum migraverant adsentationes blanditiae et peior odio amoris simulatio. Et enim in principum domo nomen tantum amicitiae, inane scilicet inrisumque remanebat. Nam qui poterat esse inter eos amicitia, quorum sibi alii domini alii servi videbantur?*

display such behaviour. Also, the successful leader will be feared rather than loved, as love can be discarded for utility, but fear never fades away (*Il Principe*, chaps. 17 and 18):

*Nasce da questo una disputa: s'elli è meglio essere amato che temuto, o e converso. Rispondesi che si vorrebbe essere l'uno e l'altro; ma perché elli è difficile accozzarli insieme, è molto più sicuro essere temuto che amato, quando si abbia a mancare dell'uno de' dua. Perché delli uomini si può dire questo generalmente: che sieno ingrati, volubili, simulatori e dissimulatori, fuggitori de' pericoli, cupidi di guadagno [...] E li uomini hanno meno rispetto a offendere uno che si facci amare, che uno che si facci temere; perché l'amore è tenuto da uno vinculo di obbligo, il quale, per essere li uomini tristi, da ogni occasione di propria utilità è rotto; ma il timore è tenuto da una paura di pena che non abbandona mai.[...]*

*A uno principe, adunque, non è necessario avere in fatto tutte le soprascritte qualità, ma è bene necessario parere di averle. Anzi ardirò di dire questo, che, avendole et osservandole sempre, sono dannose, e parendo di averle, sono utile: come parere pietoso, fedele, umano, intero, religioso, et essere; ma stare in modo edificato con l'animo, che, bisognando non essere, tu possa e sappi mutare el contrario.*

From this a debate is originated: if it is better for him to be loved than feared, or vice versa. The answer is that one would like to be both the one and the other; but because it is difficult to combine them, it is far safer to be feared than loved if you cannot be both. Because this can be said in general about men: that they are ungrateful, changeable, deceivers and dissimulating, escaping dangers, greedy for money. [...] And men have less respect in doing an injury to one that is loved than one who is feared; because love is held on by an obligation which is broken anytime there is a personal utility; but fear is held on by the threat of punishment that never goes away.[...]

It is not necessary for the prince to actually have these qualities, but it is necessary to seem to have them. I will dare say this, that having them and always observing them, they are harmful, whilst faking to have them, they are useful: as appearing merciful, loyal, human, all of one piece, religious, and be them; but be in such a disposition then, when it is necessary not to be, you can and know how to change in the opposite.

It is easy to trace back the long way gone since Cicero's claim that love is the best way to defend power.<sup>12</sup> There is no space for honesty and true feelings in the life of a ruler, and falsity becomes the only true sign of an effective leadership. Moreover, a closer analysis of Machiavelli's political theory - which goes beyond the aims of the present work - reveals

Rosetta 12. [http://www.rosetta.bham.ac.uk/issue\\_12/brunetta.pdf](http://www.rosetta.bham.ac.uk/issue_12/brunetta.pdf)

how the prince is ultimately alone in his role of leader, and cannot rely on any advice (or advisors) without incurring in the dangers of flattery<sup>13</sup>.

As modern readers, it is probably difficult to appreciate literary praise of political power; however, a reflection on how politics and literature interact one with the other -from ancient times to our days- shows the critical relevance of this topic.

### **Texts and translations:**

**\*all the translations are adapted from the following editions:**

*Plutarch, Moralia, Volume I*, transl. by F. C. Babbit, Loeb Classical library, 1984.

*Isocrates*, trans. By G. Norlin, L. van Hook, Loeb Classical library, 1968.

*Cicero, On duties (De officiis) vol XXI*, trans. By W. Miller, Loeb Classical library, 1951.

*Marziale, Epigrammi*, trans. by M. Scandola, BUR, 1996.

*Statius, Silvae*, ed. by D. R. Shackleton-Bailey, Loeb Classical library, 2003.

*Pliny, Letters and panegyricus*, trans. by B. Radice, Loeb Classical library, 1969.

*Juvenal and Persius*, ed. by T. E. Page, Loeb Classical library, 1940.

*Niccolò Machiavelli, Il Principe e opere politiche minori*, ed. by A. Zambelli, Le Monnier 1915.

---

<sup>13</sup>For excellent further reading on this matter (related to classical political thought) cf. Most 2010, pp. 14-17 and Rosati 2010.

## Bibliography

AHL, F. M. 1984, 'The rider and the horse: politics and power in Roman poetry from Horace to Statius', *ANRW* 2. 32. 1, pp. 40-110.

BARTSCH, S. 1994, *Actors in the Audience. Theatricality and Doublespeak from Nero to Hadrian*, Cambridge, Mass. - London.

BRAUND, S.M. 1998, 'Praise and Protreptic in Early Imperial Panegyric: Cicero, Seneca, Pliny', in *WHITBY (ed.), The Propaganda of Power. The Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity*, Leiden, pp. 53-75.

COLEMAN, K.M. 1986, 'The Emperor Domitian and Literature', *ANRW* 2.32.5, pp. 3087-3115.

FABBRINI, D. 2007, *Il migliore dei mondi possibili. Gli epigrammi efrastici di Marziale per amici e protettori*, Firenze.

FEDELI, P. 2007, *Dalla poesia d'amore alla poesia dell'esilio*, Milano.

GALASSO, L. 1987, 'Modelli tragici e ricodificazione elegiaca: appunti sulla poesia ovidiana dell'esilio', *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici*, No. 18, pp. 83-99.

GARTHWAITE, J. 1984, 'Statius, *Silvae*, 3.4; On the fate of Earinus', *ANRW* 2. 32. 5, pp. 111-124.

GEYSSEN, J.W. 1996, *Imperial Panegyric in Statius. A Literary Commentary on *Silvae* 1.1*, New York.

GIBSON, B. 2011, 'Contemporary contexts', in *ROCHE (ed.), Pliny's praise, the Panegyricus in the Roman world*, Cambridge, pp. 104-124.

LOTITO, G. 1974-1975, 'Il tipo etico del liberto funzionario di corte (Stazio, *Silvae* III 3 e V 1)', *DArch* 8, pp. 275-383.

MOST, G. W. 2010, 'Power and truth in Archaic Greece-and after', *Dicere laudes-Elogio, comunicazione, creazione del consenso, Atti del convegno internazionale, Cividale del Friuli, 23-25 settembre 2010, a cura di Gianpaolo Urso (Ed.)*, pp. 13-26.

NAGLE. B, 1980, *The Poetics of Exile: Program and Polemic in the Tristia and Epistulae ex Ponto of Ovid*, Brussels.

NAUTA-VAN DAM-SMOLENAARS 2006 (eds.), *Flavian poetry*, Leiden.

NAUTA-VAN DAM-SMOLENAARS 2008 (eds.), *The poetry of Statius*, Leiden.

NEWLANDS, C. 2002, *Statius' Silvae and the Poetics of Empire*, Cambridge.

NEWLANDS, C. 2009, 'Statius' Self-conscious Poetics: Hexameter on Hexameter', in DOMINIK- GARTHWAITE-ROCHE (eds.), *Writing Politics in Imperial Rome*, Leiden - Boston, pp. 387-404.

NISBET-HUBBARD 1970, *A commentary on Horace: Odes book 1*, Oxford.

PICONE, G. (ed.) 2008, *Clementia Caesaris. Modelli etici, parentesi e retorica dell'esilio*, Palermo.

ROSATI, G. 2002, 'Muse and Power in the Poetry of Statius', in SPENTZOU-FOWLER (eds.), *Cultivating the Muse. Struggles for Power and Inspiration in Classical Literature*, Oxford, pp. 229-251.

ROSATI, G. 2003, "Dominus/domina": moduli dell'encomio cortigiano e del corteggiamento amoroso', in R. GAZICH (ed.), *'Fecunda licentia'. Tradizione e innovazione in Ovidio elegiaco*, Milano, 49-69.

ROSATI, G. 2006, 'Luxury and Love: the Encomium as Aestheticisation of Power in Flavian Poetry', in NAUTA-VAN DAM-SMOLENAARS (edd.), *Flavian Poetry*, Leiden - Boston - Köln, pp. 41-58.

ROSATI, G. 2008, 'Staius, Domitian and Acknowledging Paternity. Rituals of Succession in the Thebaid', in *SMOLENAARS-VAN DAM-NAUTA (eds.), The Poetry of Staius*, Leiden - Boston - Köln, pp. 175-193.

ROSATI, G. 2010, 'Amare il tiranno. Creazione del consenso e linguaggio encomiastico nella cultura flavia', *Dicere laudes-Elogio, comunicazione, creazione del consenso, Atti del convegno internazionale, Cividale del Friuli, 23-25 settembre 2010, a cura di Gianpaolo Urso (Ed.)*, pp. 265-279.

*SMOLENAARS, J.J.L. 2006, 'Ideology and Poetics along the via Domitiana: Staius Silvae 4.3', in NAUTA-VAN DAM-SMOLENAARS (eds.), Flavian Poetry*, Leiden - Boston - Köln, pp. 223-244.

WALLACE-HADRILL, A. 1996, 'The Imperial Court', in *BOWMAN-CHAMPLIN-LINTOTT (eds.), The Cambridge Ancient History. X. The Augustan Empire, 43 B.C.- A.D. 69*, Cambridge, pp. 283-308.

ZEINER, N.K. 2005, *Nothing Ordinary Here: Staius as Creator of Distinction in the Silvae*, New York - London.